## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

IN RE: DEPUY ORTHOPAEDICS, INC. ASR HIP IMPLANT	) MDL Docket No. 1:10-md-2197-DAK
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	) HONORABLE DAVID A. KATZ )
This Document Relates to:	) ) CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER NO. 16
ALL CASES	ORDER FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF PLAINTIFFS' SETTLEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

In each Multi District Litigation matter, the parties and the various courts involved attempt to balance many competing interests. In working towards a resolution of any mass tort case, one critical issue to establish at the outset, and maintain throughout the litigation, is an environment where cooperation and communication between the federal MDL and those who have cases in various state court jurisdictions is achieved.

In this litigation, Judge Deborah Mary Dooling of the Illinois Circuit Court of Cook County, Judge Richard A. Kramer of the San Francisco Superior Court, Judge Brian R. Martinotti of the New Jersey Superior Court of Bergen County, Hon. Crystal Dixon Mittel staedt, Maryland Circuit Court for Prince George's County, along with many other state court judges and myself, each assigned as the presiding judge for the respective coordinated proceedings, sought to foster cooperation in this litigation with the Plaintiffs' leadership from those respective states, the MDL and the defense.

This cooperation and communication has resulted in a coordinated group of Plaintiffs' attorneys from the MDL as well as the cooperating st ate court jurisdicti ons working to gether to prepare and advance this litigation together at all stages. While each court main tains its jurisdictional independence as set forth, for example, in CAJCCP CMO 1, Section C – Jurisdiction, cooperation of state and federal litigation in mass torts such as this provide s the ability to review massive document production in an efficient and effective manner. In this case, Defendants produced over five million documents, consisting of almost 80 million

pages. The coordinatin gleadership of Plaintiffs' counsel from the MDL and cooperating state—courts was essential to the organization, direction and co—mpletion of the necess—ary document revie w. Bec ause of the cooperative efforts of Plaintiffs' attorneys from both the MDL and state court litigations, the daunting task of reviewing those documents was completed allowing additional discovery and trial preparation to advance.

This coordinating leaders hip also completed 58 fact witnes is depositions in six states and three international venues which resulted in 101 days of testimony and 37,033 pages of transcripts, communicated with individual plaintiff's counsel as needed and created a website for participating attorney is a six a clearinghouse of substantive information, retained and prepared multiple expert witnesses, tried two cases to verdict, and prepared for five additional trials for Fall 2013 in state court venues and the MDL. Finally, this group and the appointed Plaintiffs' leadership have expended significant sums of money for costs and invested significant labor in furtherance of this litigat ion. The result has been the creation of a singular work product encompassing the document review, depositions, experts, trial strategies, preparation and exhibits.

Because of the cooperation and communication fostered by the presiding Judges and achieved by the respective I eadership and defense, no competing work product was created. The excessive cost and inefficiencies that come from multiple jurisdictions moving at cross purposes was eliminated in this case. The plaintiffs in each jurisdiction dramatically benefited from this unprecedented development of a single work product and each jurisdiction was then able to utilize that single work product to develop the cases within their independent jurisdictions.

This case has now reached a point of a private resolution agreement. Along with Judges Dooling, Kramer, Martinotti, and Mittlestaedt, we have determ ined that continued cooperation is appropriate as settlement advances an important public policy and that a committee should be appointed in furtherance of a private resolution.

This committee will address the prospective resolution, build consensus, effect uate a fair settlem ent for all who may qualify under the terms of a private resolution agreement, and assist and oversee the program which would be developed as a result of any private resolution as well as interact with those federal and state courts having jurisdiction over cas es relating to the ASR Hip matter and take all a ctions neces sary and/or incidental to the fair resolution of claims of those individuals entitled to compensation under the terms of said

private resolution agreement. The Committee shall include representatives from both the MDL and state courts who have been integral parts of the cooperative team that has advanced this litigation to this critical juncture.

Now therefore, the Court, in anticipation of adoption and endorsement by the State Court Judges from cooperating jurisdictions, appoints the following firms by the designated representatives as m embers of said "Settlement Oversight Committee," to serve until further Order of the Court, in accordance with and pursuant to the terms of any private agreement reached between the parties on behalf of a ll those who may qualify in any of the cooperating jurisdictions:

Steven J. Skikos Michael A. Kelly Adriana Suarez Desmond Khaldoun A. Baghdadi

SKIKOS, CRAWFORD, SKIKOS & JOSEPH LLP WALKUP, MELODIA, KELLY & SCHONENBERGER

Ellen Relkin Brian Panish

Perry Weitz
Hon. Peter J. Polos (Ret.)
WEITZ & LUXENBERG, P.C.
PANISH SHEA & BOYLE, LLP

R. Eric Kennedy

WEISMAN, KENNEDY & BERRIS CO., L.P.A.

Peter J. Flowers

MEYERS & FLOWERS

Mark P. Robinson, Jr.

ROBINSON, CALCAGNIE, ROBINSON, SHAPIRO,
DAVIS, INC.

Kenneth M. Seeger
Brian J. Devine
SEEGER SALVAS, LLP

Michael Papantonio

Lawrence J. Gornick

Ben W. Gordon, Jr.

KAISER & GORNICK, LLP

LEVIN, PAPANTANIO, THOMAS, MITCHELL,
RAFFERTY & PROCTOR, P.A.

Daniel R. Lapinski
WILENTZ, GOLDMAN & SPITZER. P.A.

Christopher A. Seeger

DavidR.Buchanan

Edward Blizzard

SEEGER WEISS LLP

BLIZZARD MCCARTHY & NABERS, LLP

Michelle L. Kranz Jayne Conroy

ZOLL, KRANZ & BORGESS, LLC
HANLEY CONROY BIERSTEIN SHERIDAN FISHER
HAYES LLP

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: November 18, 2013

U.S. DAVID A. KATZ
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE